

Journal of Psychopharmacology: Null results in Brief

EMD386088 (5mg/kg) has no effect on latent inhibition shown to both light and noise stimuli

*Cassaday, H.J. and Thur, K.E.

School of Psychology,

University of Nottingham,

Nottingham, UK.

*Correspondence:

helen.cassaday@nottingham.ac.uk

School of Psychology

University of Nottingham

University Park

Nottingham, NG7 2RD.

phone: +44 (0)115 951 5124

fax: +44 (0)115 951 5324

Running head: EMD386088 and latent inhibition

Abstract

Activation of 5-HT₆ receptors stimulates attentional switching and 5-HT₆ receptor antagonists are **putative drugs for psychosis**. Latent inhibition (LI) provides a pre-clinical model of attentional switching and ‘antipsychotic-like’ action and is known to be modulated by 5-HT. In the present study, LI was shown in a fear conditioning procedure which measured suppression of drinking after conditioning with footshock. In two experiments (each N=48) it was shown that pre-exposure to both light and noise conditioned stimuli reduced conditioned suppression relative to the corresponding non-pre-exposed control. However, counter to prediction, LI was intact after treatment with the 5-HT₆ agonist EMD386088 (5mg/kg).

[99/100 words]

Keywords: fear conditioning, latent inhibition, 5-hydroxytyptamine, EMD386088

Introduction

Amongst the multiplicity of 5-HT receptor sub-types, the 5-HT₆ receptor in particular is located in brain regions involved in learning and memory (Fone, 2008; **Ivachtchenko et al, 2016**). Consistent with this receptor distribution, 5-HT₆ receptor antagonists **can** improve learning and memory in a variety of procedures (Fone, 2008; **Ivachtchenko et al, 2016**). However, the evidence for their efficacy in animal models for schizophrenia is limited (Gravius et al., 2001). Latent inhibition (LI) provides a pre-clinical model of attentional switching **to test drugs for psychosis** (**Weiner, 1990**; Nelson et al., 2011). Specifically LI refers to the reduction in associative learning produced by **pre**-exposure to the intended conditioned stimulus (CS), relative to a non-pre-exposed group for which the CS is novel. With experimental parameters **set to produce weak LI in controls, there was no evidence for enhancement of LI** following

treatment with 5-HT₆ antagonists (Leng et al., 2003). However, a **variety of serotonergic manipulations have well-documented effects on LI (Weiner, 1990)** and the effects of 5-HT₆ agonists have not been reported.

In the present study, a similar fear conditioning procedure (suppression of drinking after conditioning with footshock) was used to test the prediction that treatment with the 5-HT₆ agonist EMD386088 should reduce LI, **by restoring conditioning to the pre-exposed stimuli**. EMD386088 was administered at 5mg/kg, the dose previously **identified to attenuate prior learning** in a similar fear conditioning procedure (**Supplementary Material**). **This dose also restored fear conditioning which was attenuated because of cholinergic hypoactivity** (Woods et al., 2012).

Methods

For each experiment, 48 experimentally naïve adult male Wistar rats (Charles River, UK; average start weight 220g) were caged in pairs on a 12:12h light/dark cycle with *ad libitum* food. All procedures were carried out in accordance with the United Kingdom (UK) Animals Scientific Procedures Act 1986, Project Licence number: PPL40/3163 and following an established LI procedure (Nelson et al., 2011).

Water deprivation was used to motivate licking in a conditioned suppression of drinking procedure, conducted within six automated conditioning boxes (Cambridge Cognition, Cambridge, UK). In Experiment 1, a flashing light of overall 5s duration served as the CS for the control group of rats and was first presented without consequence (x30) in the pre-exposed (PE) groups. In Experiment 2, a 5s mixed frequency noise set at 85dB served as the CS for control group and was first presented without consequence (x30) in the PE groups. In both experiments, **scrambled** footshock of 1s duration and 1mA intensity provided the

unconditioned stimulus (Nelson et al., 2011). **Both experiments used a 4-day procedure for pre-exposure, conditioning, reshaping and test (Nelson et al., 2011).**

EMD386088 HCl (Tocris, UK) was dissolved in saline at 5mg/ml for injection (i.p.) at 1ml/kg to administer a dose of 5mg/kg. Drug or **saline (1ml/kg)** control injections were administered 30 min prior to the pre-exposure and conditioning stages of the LI procedure.

Associative learning and LI thereof was measured as suppression ratios.

Results

In both experiments, the baseline licking scores seen pre-conditioning confirmed that the rats were well-matched across their experimental allocations (Table 1). As might be expected, after conditioning the latencies to drink in the boxes were longer and the rats drank less, reflecting fear conditioning to context measured on the reshaping day. However, there was no effect of EMD386088 on fear conditioning to context in either experiment.

----- Table 1 about here -----

Effects of EMD386088 on latent inhibition with a light CS

In the key conditioned suppression tests (Figure 1A) data from one rat was lost due to equipment failure. There was a main effect of conditioning group [$F(1,43)=18.41$, $p<0.001$]. Thus LI was demonstrated with the light CS. However, there was no effect of drug, either overall or in interaction with pre-exposure [maximum $F(1,43)=0.352$].

----- Figure 1 about here -----

Effects of EMD386088 on latent inhibition with a noise CS

ANOVA showed a main effect of conditioning group [$F(1,44)=12.46$, $p=0.001$]. Thus LI was **also** demonstrated with the noise CS (**Figure 1B**). However, there was no effect of drug, either overall or in interaction with pre-exposure [maximum $F(1,44)=0.21$].

Conclusions

Contrary to prediction, there was no indication of any effect of 5mg/kg EMD386088 on LI. It is a limitation of the present study that further doses were not examined. However, the dose selected for use has previously been reported effective (Woods et al., 2012). The present study used 30 pre-exposures to the subsequent CS, resulting in robust LI irrespective of whether this stimulus was light (Experiment 1) or noise (Experiment 2). Since in common with 5-HT₆ antagonists, 5-HT₆ agonists can show paradoxical pro-cognitive effects (Fone 2008) and EMD386088 is a partial agonist **with an irregular dose-response** (Jastrzębska-Więsek et al., 2013), it remains possible that LI enhancement under EMD386088 could be revealed under conditions of fewer pre-exposures, drug-induced impairment, or at a different dose.

[793/800]

Declaration of conflicting interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Funding

This work was supported by the Wellcome Trust [grant number 082940].

ORCID iD

Helen Cassaday id <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9227-373X>

References

1. Fone KCF (2008) An update on the role of the 5-hydroxytryptamine₆ receptor in cognitive function. *Neuropharmacol* 55: 1015-1022.

2. Gravius A, Laszy J, Pietraszek M, Saghy K, Nagel J, Chambon C, et al. (2001) Effects of 5-HT₆ antagonists, Ro-4368554 and SB-258585, in tests used for the detection of cognitive enhancement and antipsychotic-like activity. *Behav Pharmacol* 22: 122-35.
3. Ivachtchenko AV, Lavrovsky Y and Ivanenkov YA (2016) AVN-211, novel and highly selective 5-HT₆ receptor small molecule antagonist, for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease. *Mol Pharm* 13:945-63.
4. Jastrzębska-Więsek M, Siwek A, Kazek G, Nawieśniak B, Partyka A, Marcinkowska M, et al. (2013) Partial agonist efficacy of EMD386088, a 5-HT₆ receptor ligand, in functional in vitro assays. *Pharmacol Rep* 65: 998-1005.
5. Leng A, Ouagazzal A, Feldon J and Higgins GA (2003) Effect of the 5-HT₆ receptor antagonists Ro 04-6790 and Ro 65-7199 on latent inhibition and prepulse inhibition in the rat: Comparison to clozapine. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 75: 281-288.
6. Nelson AJD, Thur KE, Marsden CA, Cassaday HJ (2011) Dopamine in nucleus accumbens: Salience modulation in latent inhibition and overshadowing. *J Psychopharmacol* 25: 1649-1660.
7. Weiner I (1990) Neural substrates of latent inhibition: The switching model. *Psychol Bull* 108: 442-461.
8. Woods S, Clarke NN, Layfield R and Fone KCF (2012) 5-HT₆ receptor agonists and antagonists enhance learning and memory in a conditioned emotion response paradigm by modulation of cholinergic and glutamatergic mechanisms. *Br J Pharmacol* 167: 436-449.

	Measure	Saline (N=24 x2)	EMD386088 5mg/kg (N=24 x2)	Statistics for main effect of drug (<i>p</i>)	Statistics for drug x pre- exposure interaction (<i>p</i>)
Experiment 1					
Pre-conditioning	latency	5.21 (1.29)	6.25 (1.47)	0.60	0.95
	min 1 licks	280.92 (8.28)	276.50 (10.99)	0.75	0.25
	total licks	1860.38 (101.06)	1906.46 (98.11)	0.75	0.98
Reshaping	latency	162.79 (49.92)	108.71 (27.94)	0.36	0.92
	min 1 licks	227.17 (17.21)	200.58 (21.14)	0.35	0.89
	total licks	1676.75 (119.95)	1627.21 (126.72)	0.78	0.99
Experiment 2					
Pre-conditioning	latency	7.38 (1.85)	6.92 (2.42)	0.88	0.61
	min 1 licks	284.42 (14.09)	281.79 (13.56)	0.89	0.36
	total licks	1931.58 (114.76)	1862.75 (96.36)	0.65	0.34
Reshaping	latency	23.13 (4.41)	66.83 (22.94)	0.07	0.57
	min 1 licks	236.46 (18.80)	197.92 (22.12)	0.19	0.98
	total licks	1819.08 (118.80)	1712.25 (73.91)	0.45	0.54

Table 1. Mean lick latencies and numbers of licks (\pm S.E.M.) in Experiments 1 and 2

($N=24/\text{drug group/experiment}$). Data were analysed with between subjects factors of drug (saline, EMD386088) and the allocated behavioural condition (pre-exposed, non-pre-exposed). The *p* values shown are for the main effect of drug and for the interaction term.

There were 5 days of pre-conditioning during which rats became accustomed to drinking in the boxes. The data from the 5th day are shown for direct comparison with the reshaping day which followed pre-exposure and conditioning under drug.




Figure 1: (A) Mean suppression ratio (\pm S.E.M.) to the light for control (light blue) and preexposed (PE; dark orange) groups following treatment with saline or 5mg/kg EMD386088 in Experiment 1 ($N=47$). (B) Mean suppression ratio (\pm S.E.M.) to the noise for control (light blue) and preexposed (PE; dark orange) groups following treatment with saline or 5mg/kg EMD386088 in Experiment 2 ($N=48$).